United Nations

A/C.1/53/PV.24

General Assembly

Fifty-third session

Official Records

First Committee

24th Meeting

Thursday, 5 November 1998, 10 a.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Mernier . . . . . (Belgium)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda items 63 to 80 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: Members have this morning received informal paper number 2, containing the list of draft resolutions in clusters 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 that we will try to take up today. We will start with cluster 6, as agreed yesterday.

The first draft resolution to be dealt with is draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

If no delegation wishes to make a general statement on the draft resolutions in cluster 6, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43.

A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4 (b) and on operative paragraph 6. Operative paragraph 4 (b) reads as follows:

> "Recalls its request to the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2000, on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the views expressed by Member States and his reports on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with the view to a decision at its fifty-fifth session".

As no delegation wishes to explain its position before we take a decision on operative paragraph 4 (b), I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 19th meeting, on 30 October 1998.

In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution, it is sponsored by the countries listed in document A/C.1/53/INF/2 and Add.1 and Add.2.

The Committee will now proceed to the vote on paragraph 4 (b). I shall now close the voting.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Egypt is shown on the board as having abstained, but we did not press any button.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): There may be a technical problem. The print-out of the vote may show the correct position.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus,

98-86314 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Algeria, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia

Paragraph 4 (b) of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43 was retained by 100 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Bolivia, El Salvador, Jamaica, Malawi, the Philippines and the Republic of Moldova informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic had intended to abstain; the delegation of Egypt had intended not to participate.]

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): If no delegation wishes to explain its vote, we shall now take a decision on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43, which reads:

(*spoke in English*)

"Invites the Conference on Disarmament to consider continuing its work undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments".

As no delegation wishes to explain its position before action is taken on the paragraph, I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Algeria, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Yemen

Paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43 was retained by 102 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Bolivia, El Salvador, Jamaica, Malawi and the Philippines informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Syria had intended to abstain.]

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43 as a whole.

I call first on the representative of Egypt, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): I wish to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Since the adoption in 1991 of resolution 46/36 L, which established the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, Egypt has faithfully advocated the principle of transparency in military matters. Egypt has been supportive of the objectives underlying the establishment of the Register. Between 1991 and 1993, Egypt lent its support to the annual General Assembly resolutions on transparency in armaments, which were adopted without a vote. However, Egypt changed its vote to an abstention beginning in 1994, when the Group of Governmental Experts on the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development was unable to reach agreement on matters relating to the further development of the Register.

For the Register to attain its objectives as a truly significant confidence-building measure capable of eliminating suspicion and misperceptions and thereby contributing to the enhancement of security and stability, it must in our view fulfil the following requirements: first, it must be a universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory confidence-building measure; secondly, it must ensure that all States have equal rights and obligations; thirdly, it must address the legitimate security concerns of all States; and fourthly, it must provide the broadest transparency in all fields of armament in a non-selective manner.

The United Nations Register in its present form may meet the security concerns of certain States. But it does not adequately meet those of Egypt. Only an expanded Register that provides a comprehensive picture and covers in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner the overall military capabilities of States can serve the cause of transparency in armaments. We cannot help but conclude that other countries do not share our enthusiasm, and that they wish to limit the transparency exercise to certain categories of conventional weapons, namely those which currently make up the United Nations Register. That approach is not consistent with agreements reached in the General Assembly in 1991 regarding the early expansion of the scope of the Register. It is also discriminatory, insofar as it requires those States which possess little more than the seven categories listed in the Register to report on virtually everything their armed forces own, while other States, with more advanced military capabilities, are not required to apply transparency to all the armaments and weapons systems in their possession, especially weapons of mass destruction.

Finally, we emphasize that we are not impressed by the prospects for the possible eventual development of the Register in terms of the expansion of its scope. Such prospects seem remote in view of the apparent lack of eagerness on the part of the international community faithfully to embrace the principles and objectives of transparency or to apply them in a comprehensive, non-discriminatory and equitable manner.

For these reasons, my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43, as a whole, was adopted by 112 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Bolivia, El Salvador, Ghana, Jamaica, Malawi and the Philippines informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I now call on those representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish to explain why my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

The Islamic Republic of Iran supports transparency in armaments as a confidence-building measure. We are cognizant of the instrumental role that an enhanced level of transparency could play in building security and confidence among States. We have participated actively in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms since 1992, when it was established, and we will continue to do so. However, we note that contrary to the understanding reached in the adoption of resolution 46/36 L of 1991 and contrary to the content of the resolution — which provided for phased transparency in armaments, including in nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction, high-technology weapons systems and conventional armaments — no concrete efforts have been made so far to expand the scope of the Register to include data on all categories of weapons.

We believe that extending transparency to other categories of weapons would facilitate the negotiations on a fissile materials cut-off treaty and would result in more progress in the area of nuclear disarmament. In our view, indifference to these facts was the main reason for the failure in 1997 of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Register to make substantive recommendations to the General Assembly.

Replies that the Secretariat has received from Governments demonstrate that, regrettably, no rigorous efforts have been made to promote full regional participation in the Register on an equitable basis, especially in regions that account for the most conventional arms transfers, such as the Middle East. My delegation is ready to consider any proposal for starting negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on transparency in armaments, provided that such a proposal promotes greater transparency in nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction, high-technology weapons systems and conventional weapons in a non-discriminatory manner.

Mr. Pang Sen (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): My delegation understands that the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms was originally intended to contribute to confidence-building through enhanced transparency in conventional armaments and a gradual movement towards rational control of the transfer of conventional arms, so as to promote peace and security. On an experimental basis, China participated in the Register from 1993.

As is well known, the Register is a transparency measure governing lawful arms transfers between sovereign States,as provided for in resolution 46/36 L. Regrettably, however, a certain country has for three consecutive years — since 1996 — in gross defiance of the relevant provisions of that resolution, registered its arms sales to Taiwan, a province of China, on the Register in the form of so-called footnotes. It must be pointed out that selling arms to Taiwan is not only a violation of China's sovereignty but a gross interference in its internal affairs. Moreover, it is obviously not an arms transfer between sovereign States. The practice of registering arms sales to Taiwan on the Register has changed the nature of this Register of transfers between sovereign States and has resulted in its politicization, thus compelling China to suspend its participation in the Register.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43, among other things, calls on Member States to respond to the request of the Secretary-General by providing him data and information for the Register. Under the current circumstances, China obviously cannot provide the data and information as requested. Therefore, China cannot support this draft resolution, and my delegation demands that the parties concerned take immediate action to correct their incorrect practices in order to maintain the seriousness of the United Nations Register.

In addition, this draft resolution once again requests the Secretary-General to establish a group of experts for the further development of the Register. It also requests that the Conference on Disarmament should work in the field of transparency of arms transfers. The Chinese delegation still has different views on these points.

That is why my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): I am taking the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Myanmar believes that transparency in armaments can be a useful confidence-building measure, provided that it is non-discriminatory, universal and voluntary. The draft resolution contains the shortcomings present in the draft resolutions on the subject at previous sessions.

My delegation has reservations on paragraphs 4 (b) and 6. In paragraph 4 (b), the General Assembly would call for the convening of a group of governmental experts in the year 2000 and would call on the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development. We believe that we still need to review and reassess the operation of the Register. It is therefore premature and unnecessary at this juncture to further develop the Register. In view of the track record of the group of experts, we also have misgivings about the effectiveness and usefulness of holding another meeting of a group of experts in this regard.

Moreover, we do not see any urgent need for the Conference on Disarmament to take up the issue of transparency in armaments, as called for in paragraph 6, at a time when it ought to be concentrating on banning fissile materials, on nuclear disarmament and on other pressing issues.

Accordingly, my delegation abstained in the voting on paragraphs 4 (b) and 6, as well as on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation would also like to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

Algeria attaches great importance to transparency, and supports it and endorses it as a confidence-building measure, as it has always supported that and other initiatives aimed at promoting genuine, non-discriminatory transparency covering all types of weapons, including weapons of mass destruction. My delegation therefore regrets that once again this year it has been unable to support the draft resolution, which continues to deal with this matter through a framework which, in our view, has shown its incapacity to meet the expectations of States. Neither can we continue to support the continuation of initiatives which cannot give the necessary support for efforts to truly establish a system which is viable and effective and covers all types of weapons.

Algeria believes that perhaps we should define and extend the scope of transparency; perhaps it should no longer be exclusively based on resolution 46/36 L, which over time — and especially since the last session — has shown its limitations. Transparency should once again be able to include weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. This might also involve developing a position on the status of high-technology weapons and on the questions of transfers, national production and military allocations.

For those reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.43.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.43 reflects the positive balance which Cuba believes is struck by that document. My country has been participating for several years in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, which was established by resolution 46/36 L. Our experts have been part of the two working groups of governmental experts established to consider the matter and have actively contributed to their work. Nonetheless, my delegation would like to emphasize that we continue to have reservations about operative paragraph 6, and that is why we abstained from the vote on that paragraph.

It is several years now since the Conference on Disarmament concluded its work on transparency. Deciding whether or not to re-examine the question in the Conference requires taking into account the disarmament priorities established by the General Assembly. Clearly, such a decision can be taken only by the Conference on Disarmament itself. That is why my delegation reserves its right to adopt in that forum its final position on this question.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): Having received the voting sheet with regard to paragraph 4 (b) of draft resolution A/C.1/53.L.43, I would like to emphasize again that my delegation did not participate in the voting. This is not reflected in the voting sheet, and we would like it to be reflected in the records of the Committee.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The secretariat has noted the comment of the representative of Egypt, and the appropriate correction will be made.

Does any other delegation wish to take the floor with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.43? I see none.

(*spoke in English*)

We will now turn to cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

I shall first call on delegations that wish to make a general statement on that cluster.

Mr. Cho (Republic of Korea): With regard to the report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.1, my delegation welcomes the successful conclusion of the review for the rationalization of the Commission's work at the resumed session of the First Committee in June this year. We also welcome the steady progress made so far in the deliberations on nuclear-weapon-free zones and on practical disarmament measures that the Disarmament Commission took up this year. We believe that it has a unique role to play in disarmament as a specialized deliberative body with a universal membership. In this regard, in our view it should enhance its role by giving priority to creating guidelines or recommendations on the so-called emerging issues, such as practical disarmament measures or transparency in armaments.

In this connection, we hope that the Disarmament Commission will take a mid- to long-term perspective in preparing its agendas, so that Member States will be well prepared in advance for effective and efficient deliberations.

In addition, my delegation sincerely hopes that at its forthcoming session the Disarmament Commission will be able to take a final decision on convening the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Considering the remarkable progress made towards non-proliferation and disarmament since the end of the cold war, as well as the fundamental shift in the political landscape that has occurred, we believe it is time to review the most critical aspects of the process of disarmament and to set a future course of action in the field of disarmament and arms control.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.12, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament, my delegation, like all other delegations, appreciates the role of the Conference on Disarmament and its contribution to the cause of disarmament as the international community's single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

We particularly welcome the decision of the Conference on Disarmament to establish an Ad Hoc Committee entrusted with negotiations on the fissile material cut-off treaty; this is a remarkable achievement. While we look forward to substantive progress in this process of negotiations during its 1999 session, we deem it essential to ensure, from the initial stage, the full participation of all countries with nuclear capabilities.

Finally, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.5, my Government attaches great importance to the role of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific. The Centre has been making a noteworthy contribution to the cause of peace and disarmament by being actively engaged in a number of programmes known as the "Kathmandu process" for disarmament and regional stability. In this vein, my delegation appreciates and supports its plan to organize a United Nations disarmament conference in Nagasaki, later this month, focused on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. We trust that these activities will be further promoted.

In recognition of the Regional Centre's important role, my Government plans to make a financial contribution towards the cost of its activities this year, as we have done in previous years.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to make a general statement on cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery", the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.1, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission".

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

There being no objection, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.1, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission", was introduced by the representative of Belarus at the 18th meeting, on 29

October 1998. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/53/INF/2.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Does any delegation wish to explain its position before a decision is taken on the draft resolution? As I see none, may I take it that the draft resolution is adopted?

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.1 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

(*spoke in English*)

There being none, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.8, entitled

(*spoke in French*)

"United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa".

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. As I hear no objection, I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.8, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 16th meeting on 27 October 1998. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/53/INF/2.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): If no delegation wishes to explain its position before a decision is taken, may I take it that the draft resolution is adopted?

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.8 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Does any delegation wish to explain its position after the decision that has just been taken? I see none.

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.18, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme". The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.18, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 19th meeting, on 30 October 1998. Additional sponsors to those listed in the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/53/INF/2.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): If no delegation wishes to explain its position before a decision is taken, may I take it that the draft resolution is adopted?

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.18 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Does any delegation wish to explain its position after the decision? I see none.

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.25, entitled "United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament".

The sponsors have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. Is there any objection to that procedure? There being none, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.25, entitled "United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the member States of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 21st meeting, on 2 November 1998.

As corrected in document A/C.1/INF/3, the date in the first line of the first preambular paragraph should read "22 December 1997".

The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/53/INF/2.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): If no delegation wishes to explain its position before a decision is taken, may I take it that the draft resolution is adopted?

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.25 was adopted.

The Chairman: As no delegation wishes to explain its position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.29, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship training and advisory services".

The sponsors have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. Is there any objection to that procedure?

There being no objection, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.29, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship training and advisory services", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 16th meeting on 27 October 1998. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, additional sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/53/INF/2.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Does any delegation wish to explain its position before we take a decision? I see none, so may I take it that the draft resolution is adopted?

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.29 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): If no delegation wishes to explain its position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to cluster 8.

(*spoke in English*)

Is there any delegation wishing to make general statements on that cluster? As I see none, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.15. Does any delegation wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting? I see none.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.15 is entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the 17th meeting, on 28 October 1998. Sponsors additional to those listed in the draft resolution are listed in document A/53/C.1/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Marshall Islands, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Ukraine, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.15 was adopted by 77 votes to 43, with 16 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Jordan informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Argentina, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Ms. Martinic (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to voice certain considerations with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.15, entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament".

Argentina currently enjoys cooperation in the field of technological materials and also supplies various countries represented here. We are convinced that the exchange of technology is benefited and even increased when it takes place within a clear and reliable framework of responsible use of technology. In turn, the lack of access to technology arises out of policies that generate uncertainty and instability. Countries that are more developed associate themselves with those that contribute to the non-proliferation regime and offer guarantees for the peaceful use of such technologies.

That has been and remains the policy of Argentina. Our nuclear cooperation policies recognize contributions from countries with a higher level of technological development. In turn, Argentina's programmes with friendly countries are based on the same spirit of transparency and confidence and on the guarantees provided by safeguard systems. We hope that our experience of regional integration and cooperation will stimulate a broad process at the international level, with up-to-date technologies that will do away with underdevelopment and contribute to securing peace and stability.

We know from our own experience that both of these objectives are perfectly easy to reconcile. That is why my country abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.15, which does not recognize the contribution of control regimes to cooperation in this field.

The Chairman: We shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security".

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. Is there any objection? As I see none, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.17/Rev.1, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security", was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 28 October 1998.

The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/53/INF/2/Add.2.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As no delegation wishes to explain its position before we take a decision, may I take it that the draft resolution is adopted?

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions following the adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): The United States joined in adoption by consensus of the draft resolution entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". We commend the flexibility shown by the main sponsor in pursuing this initiative. We believe the text just developed outlines a balanced approach that will enable the international community to begin thoughtful and reflective consideration of this new and complicated topic.

The General Assembly's adoption of the resolution in plenary will launch the international community on a complex enterprise encompassing many interrelated factors which representatives in the First Committee do not ordinarily address. For example, the topic includes technical aspects that relate to global communications, as well as non-technical issues associated with economic cooperation and trade, intellectual property rights, law enforcement, anti-terrorist cooperation and other issues that are considered in the Second or Sixth Committee.

Furthermore, the actions and programmes of Governments are by no means the only appropriate focus, for the initiative also involves important concerns of

individuals, associations, enterprises and other organizations that are active in the private sector.

The United States believes it will be important for the international community's future consideration of this topic to draw on the experience of representatives in the Sixth and Second Committees. We believe it will be at least equally important to seek ideas and insights from a broad range of experts in our respective Governments and societies.

Mr. Campbell (Australia): Although Australia acquiesced in the consensus on this draft resolution, we have some reservations about the text. Our general concern is based on the use of ambiguous language at various points in it. This language leaves the precise intent and implications of the draft resolution unclear. We therefore look forward to further clarification of its concept.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): Egypt, too, joined the consensus on the draft resolution, despite the broad plethora of issues it deals with. I second what the Ambassador of Australia has just said about ambiguous language. The sporadic ideas that include information terrorism, dissemination of information and pirating, as well as the inability to fully understand the relationship between all these telecommunications measures insofar as they relate to national security, leave questions unanswered.

How can we define telecommunications in the context of international security, as well as the generic nature of information? In paragraph 2 the draft resolution provides for certain associated measures, and we hope that in the reporting called for there many unanswered questions will be addressed and clarified.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of position, we shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.26, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control".

A recorded vote has been requested.

If no delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote, I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.26, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", was introduced by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the member States of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 21st meeting of the Committee, on 2 November 1998. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/53/INF/2.

The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.26.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.26 was adopted by 138 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): As we have stated for the past several years on similar draft resolutions, the United States is confused about the purpose and objectives of this draft resolution, and we frankly question its relevance to the work of the First Committee.

Simply put, the United States sees no direct connection between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control agreements. Agreements of this kind are uniquely intricate and difficult enough to negotiate, without having to consider how to focus on or draw up vague environmental norms.

Of course, no one could oppose the idea of preserving the environment. Those Member States negotiating any bilateral, regional or multilateral arms control and disarmament agreements should take relevant environmental concerns into account in carrying out such agreements. The United States Government operates under stringent domestic environmental legislation, which requires the preparation of environmental impact statements for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements.

While this year's version of this draft resolution does not include the overtly objectionable language used in previous years, we continue to question its relevance, purpose and utility, and we therefore abstained.

The Chairman: I see no other delegation wishing to take the floor, so the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.27, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. There being no objection, we shall act accordingly.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.27, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development" was introduced by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement at the 21st meeting, on 2 November 1998. In addition to the countries listed in the draft resolution, it is sponsored by the countries listed in A/C.1/53/INF/2.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As no delegation wishes to speak in explanation of position before action is taken on the draft resolution, may I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt it?

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.27 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): I request that the record of today's proceedings reflect that the United States did not participate in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.27, which asserts a relationship between disarmament and development. We believe that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that simply do not lend themselves to being linked. It was for that reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 Conference on the matter. Accordingly, the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the declarations in the "Final Document" of the International Conference.

Mr. Hajnoczi (Austria): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Iceland, align themselves with this statement.

The members of the European Union again joined the consensus on the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/53/L.27, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", and wish to clarify their understanding of it.

While they recognize the considerable benefit that may accrue from disarmament, there is no simple, automatic link between the European Union's commitments to economic and social development and to development cooperation and savings made in other areas, including disarmament.

At the same time, we would like to underline the European Union's commitment to development cooperation and to note that assistance provided by the European Union and its Member States to developing countries accounts for two thirds of the global total.

Mr. Becher (Israel): My delegation joined the consensus, but would like to dissociate itself from the fourth preambular paragraph, which makes reference to the Final Document of the meeting of the heads of State or Government of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement, which took place in Durban, South Africa, from 29 August to 3 September 1998. That Final Document contains references to my country and to the Middle East situation which we simply cannot accept.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of position.

(*spoke in English*)

As no delegation wishes to make a general statement on cluster 9, on related matters of disarmament and international security, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures".

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. There being no objection, we shall act accordingly.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.31/Rev.1, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 20th meeting, on 30 October 1998. In addition to the countries listed in the draft resolution, it is sponsored by the countries listed in A/C.1/53/INF/2 and Add.1.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As no delegation wishes to speak in explanation of position before action is taken on the draft resolution, may I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.31/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As there are no requests by delegations to explain their position after the decision on the draft resolution, we turn to

(*spoke in English*)

cluster 10, on international security.

Does any delegation wish to make a general statement on that cluster?

Mr. Calovski (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): I would like to make a general statement on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1 and of my delegation. The draft resolution would be the second General Assembly draft resolution to address one of the most urgent issues of current international relations. In the words of its eleventh preambular paragraph, there is a

> "need for United Nations measures to help prevent the violent disintegration of States, thereby enhancing the maintenance of international peace and security and economic and social advancement of all peoples".

The draft resolution addresses the issue in a positive way by underlining the emergence of new opportunities for building a peaceful world. Its starting point is observance of the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of international law. The globalization of international relations, whether political or economic, social or cultural, cannot avoid globalization of the effort to prevent new conflicts and solve ongoing ones or of the efforts to strengthen international peace and security and to promote international cooperation.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1 stresses the importance of regional efforts, and the importance of the activities of international organizations, such as the Organization of African Unity, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Organization of American States, the Association of South-East Asian Nations, the Council of Europe, the League of Arab States and the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

The draft resolution stresses in particular the importance of good-neighbourliness and the development of friendly relations among States to the solution of problems among States and calls upon all States to solve their disputes with other States by peaceful means. It affirms the need for strict compliance with the principle of the

inviolability of international borders and with the principle of the territorial integrity of any State.

In our view, draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1 does not contain controversial elements. It should be seen as an important effort of the General Assembly in the maintenance of international peace and security. Consequently, the sponsors would like it to be adopted without a vote.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Does any other delegation wish to make a general statement on this cluster? I see none.

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.32/Rev.2, "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

The sponsors have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.32/Rev.2, "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 20th meeting, on 30 October 1998. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/53/INF/2/Add.2.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As no delegation wishes to explain its position before a decision is taken, may I take it that the draft resolution is adopted?

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.32/Rev.2 was adopted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position after the decision just taken.

Mr. Becher (Israel): Israel is satisfied that an important draft resolution, important particularly to the Mediterranean States, has been adopted without a vote. The draft resolution has already been with us for some years. It sets down some major principles with a view to strengthening cooperative dialogue among the States in the region. The draft resolution can remain a matter of full consensus as long as it is not harnessed for short-sighted objectives. However, it must continue to reflect the spirit in which it was conceived and adopted.

It is the position of my delegation that all security matters pertaining to the Middle East are beholden to the peace process in the region as a whole. Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution does not take this principle into account. It is Israel's view that primacy should be given to security arrangements, which can be complemented, where appropriate, by endorsing global agreement.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation joined the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.32/Rev.2. However, I would like to place on record our reservations about the eighth preambular paragraph concerning the situation in the Middle East.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As there are no other delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1, "Maintenance of international security — prevention of the violent disintegration of States". The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. Is there any objection to that procedure?

Mr. Li Changhe (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like there to be a recorded vote on the draft resolution.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee) Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1, "Maintenance of international security — prevention of the violent disintegration of States", was introduced by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the 18th meeting of the Committee on 29 October 1998. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Before a decision is taken on the draft resolution, does any delegation wish to explain its position on it?

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): We appreciate the efforts of the delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in promoting the objectives of this draft resolution, which concerns the prevention of the violent disintegration of States.

We fully share in this objective. We shall, however, be constrained to abstain if there is a vote on the draft resolution, for two reasons.

First, the draft resolution does not contain the fundamental affirmation of the right of peoples to self-determination, peoples under colonial and foreign occupation. We witness in some cases that foreign occupation is justified by the principle of territorial integrity, and therefore we felt that it was important that this draft resolution should reflect that principle.

Secondly, the new draft includes certain concepts in its preambular part which we believe are not relevant to its purposes and objectives.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): If this draft resolution is put to the vote my delegation will, as in previous years, abstain. The reasons are few, but sufficient.

First, we are not convinced that the topic of the draft resolution is really something to be examined by the First Committee, whose mandate is essentially disarmament. I would point out that in the 1996 Disarmament Yearbook, which we use when looking for precedents in the Committee, there is no mention of resolution 51/55, adopted at the fifty-first session of the General Assembly, on this particular topic.

Secondly, just as in the case of the resolution adopted at the fifty-first session, a juridical imbalance exists in the operative paragraphs of this draft resolution. The principle of territorial integrity prevails, while two principles are omitted that are equally important and relevant to these issues: self-determination of peoples and non-interference in the domestic affairs of States.

Thirdly, the draft resolution appeals to a number of regional bodies to undertake preventive action, which, in the case of some of those bodies, might not be part of their mandates.

Mr. Aamiry (Jordan): If I can do so at this stage, Mr. Chairman, I should like to request a separate, recorded vote on operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of this draft resolution.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Delegations have heard the request by the delegation of Jordan.

Operative paragraph 3 reads:

(*spoke in English*)

> "Calls upon all States to solve their disputes with other States by peaceful means in accordance with the Charter"

Does any representative wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting?

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico will vote in favour of the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, and would not understand if a Member of the United Nations were to abstain or vote against this principle.

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is voting first on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of

Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
None

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1 was retained by 144 votes to none, with no abstentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): We shall vote next on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1, which reads:

(*spoke in English*)

"Affirms the need for strict compliance with the principle of inviolability of international borders".

Does any delegation wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting?

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): An isolated vote on a principle of international law can only be a positive vote. It would be impossible to vote against it.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
None

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1 was retained by 143 votes to none, with no abstentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): We will now take action on the draft resolution as a whole.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Chile, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Pakistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 136 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Ms. Simone (Armenia): Armenia abstained in the voting on the draft resolution on "Maintenance of international security — prevention of the violent disintegration of States", contained in document A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1, because we do not believe the text sufficiently reflects the problem.

We agree with the comment of the representative of Liechtenstein on Monday, that while the draft resolution focuses on an important issue, it does not properly address that issue and thus constitutes a lost opportunity.

While stating that the principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and international law are essential for dealing with the issues under consideration, the draft resolution fails to affirm all these principles. Armenia does not share the view of the sponsors that some have supremacy over others. We think that a draft resolution on the prevention of the violent disintegration of States, while naturally focusing on the principle of territorial integrity of States, should at the same time incorporate the principle of self-determination. We do not accept that there is a contradiction between the principles of self-determination and the principle of the territorial integrity of States. The Final Act of the Helsinki Document states that the principles should be applied jointly, and we believe that they are mutually reinforcing rather than contradictory.

Mr. Li Changhe (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): My delegation concurs with the main thrust and most of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1. Therefore, we have no difficulty in accepting it as a whole. However, a preambular paragraph contains some elements which do not fall within the purview of this Committee. We proposed amendments to the relevant sponsors, but they were not incorporated into the draft resolution. That is why my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

Mrs. Fritsche (Liechtenstein): I would like to explain why my delegation had to abstain when draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted.

The main thrust of our thinking on the draft resolution was put before the Committee during its thematic discussion on 2 November. The draft resolution just adopted deals with a highly topical issue and could have made an important contribution to the work of the General Assembly. We think it fails to do so for the following reasons.

First, the draft resolution puts a very strong emphasis on the principle of territorial integrity. Like every Member of the United Nations, we are deeply committed to this principle enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. At the same time, we find it necessary to consider this principle in a certain framework because upholding it cannot be a goal in itself; rather, it is a goal to be achieved through giving due consideration to other principles of international law.

Secondly, draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1 does not, in our opinion, live up to the expectations created by its very title, "Maintenance of international security: prevention of the violent disintegration of States". The work of the Organization in the field of prevention is gaining increasing importance and should by all accounts be further developed and enhanced, both conceptually and operationally. Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1 does not properly address the concrete efforts which are necessary to deal with the issue of the violent disintegration of States. We are grateful to see that it acknowledges the fact that the vast majority of violent conflicts at present are conflicts within States. We find it hard to understand that the text, which claims to adopt a preventive approach, does not also address the root causes of such conflicts, which can be manifold and complex, but very often lie in tensions between communities and central Governments or among such communities living within States. Analysing and trying to remedy the causes of a phenomenon seems to us inevitably a key element of any preventive effort.

As stated before, we are grateful to the main sponsor of the text and acknowledge the good intentions behind it. We would have liked to see an open discussion of this draft resolution as well as of our proposals made to it. This, unfortunately, did not happen, even though the co-sponsors were able to incorporate some of our ideas into the text. We would have been happy to support and indeed sign on to a text that properly addresses the issues before us and we regret once again this lost opportunity. We hope that we will be seized with the matter again, maybe in a different forum where a more thorough debate is possible.

Mr. González (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.44/Rev.1, which we have just adopted, my delegation abstained essentially because it agrees with the views expressed by the representatives of Mexico and Pakistan. We do not see enough recognition in the draft resolution of the legal balance that must exist between principles of international law and the Charter, particularly in the operative paragraphs. Furthermore, the door is left open to misinterpretation, or tacit authorization of the right of interference, which has not yet been established, and which is not the same as humanitarian assistance law. With this in mind, and in order to remain consistent from the legal point of view, my delegation abstained in the vote on this draft resolution.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As no other delegation wishes to speak on the draft resolution, we will now take up cluster 3,

(*spoke in English*)

"Outer space (disarmament aspects)". Does any delegation wish to make a general statement on that cluster? I see none.

The Committee will now consider draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.40, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.40, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 17th meeting, on 28 October 1998. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution, additional sponsors are listed in document A/C.1/53/INF/2.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Does any delegation wish to explain its vote before a decision is taken? I see none.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece,

Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Argentina, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.40 was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Ms. Crittenberger (United States of America): As in previous years, the United States abstained on the draft resolution entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", which this year appeared in document A/C.1/53/L.40. For almost a decade there has been unprecedented cooperation in outer space, and certainly no arms race. The 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies forbids the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction in outer space, a key prohibition that we consider both necessary and sufficient. We see no prospect of an arms race, and do not believe it would be useful or worthwhile for the Conference on Disarmament to re-establish an ad hoc committee to negotiate or deliberate on outer space topics. Instead, the Conference on Disarmament should concentrate on negotiating a treaty that would prohibit the production of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons or other explosive devices, as it finally agreed to do in August of this year.

In addition, the United States and many other countries believe that the Conference on Disarmament should negotiate a treaty that would ban the transfer or export of anti-personnel landmines. Those two efforts would undoubtedly absorb a major share of the time and energy available to delegations in Geneva.

The United States already carries out significant confidence-building and transparency measures in relation to activities in outer space. Others, however, may wish to propose additional measures, and we remain willing to discuss specific proposals on their merits.

Mr. Seibert (Germany): My delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote on behalf of Germany and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland regarding the decision just taken on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.40, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". Although our delegations supported the draft resolution, we want to make sure that our votes are not misconstrued when the subject of outer space is addressed at the 1999 session of the Conference on Disarmament. In the past, both the United Kingdom and Germany have actively contributed to the work of the ad hoc committee on outer space and have also formulated a number of proposals. Unfortunately, it was not possible to achieve consensus on any of the proposals that were discussed at the time. Germany and the United Kingdom recognize the continued validity of the subject. We are therefore ready to support the reappointment of the Special Coordinator on this item in the Conference on Disarmament and the re-examination and possible updating of the relevant mandate with an open mind and in a constructive manner. The decision on whether to re-establish an ad hoc committee on outer space should, however, depend on whether it will be possible to identify substantive issues on which useful work can be done in the framework of an ad hoc committee.

Our delegations hold the view that the Conference on Disarmament has other important work to do in 1999, which in our view should be given high priority. First and foremost, our delegations are committed to an early start of negotiations on a fissile materials cut-off treaty at the outset of next year's session. For this reason, our positive vote on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.40 should not be understood as automatic approval of the re-establishment of an ad hoc

committee. It was intended rather to demonstrate our flexibility on the matter. We will enter the discussions on the programme of work of the Conference on Disarmament for 1999 in a constructive spirit, and we are ready to re-examine the question of the most appropriate way to deal with the issue of outer space in the light of the points I have just mentioned.

Programme of work

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The Committee has taken action on all the draft resolutions scheduled for this morning. Only four further draft resolutions are at present ready for consideration: A/C.1/53/L.2, A/C.1/53/L.7/Rev.1, A/C.1/53/L.13/Rev.1 and A/C.1/53/L.36. Action on these will be taken tomorrow morning; there will be no meeting this afternoon. I urge delegations which had requested the postponement of action on draft resolutions but which are now ready to put those texts to the vote to inform the secretariat so that a complete list can be prepared.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.